DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 029 827 SP 002 619

The Preparation of Teachers for Junior Colleges. Report of Annual Missouri Valley Conference on Junior and Senior College Cooperation (2nd, May 5-6, 1967).

Central Missouri State Coll., Warrensburg.
Pub Date May 67
Note-25p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.35
Descriptors-•College Teachers, •Junior Colleges, •Teacher Education

Preparation of teachers for the junior college, which is the fastest growing segment of American higher education, was the topic of the second Missouri Valley Conference. Roger H. Garrison reported that the evolving status of the junior college locates the junior college teacher's position between the high school teacher and the college professor, but the pragmatism of junior college instructional aims--producing transferable students as well as technical and lower level management personnel--requires unique skills. Preparation of teachers of academic subjects should include interdisciplinary studies, supervised junior college teaching experience, and a professional seminar to meet throughout the graduate program. Teachers of vocational subjects need extensive work experience, background courses in their specialties, and methods courses. Elmer J. Clark recommended the establishment of special graduate programs where prospective junior college teachers take graduate majors emphasizing breadth rather than specialization or research, professional courses in educational psychology and junior college teaching, and supervised internship. The value was noted, in general discussion, of short courses, seminars, and brief institutes stressing the history and philosophy of the junior college, the nature of teaching, characteristics of students, group dynamics, and general orientation to junior college procedures. (DL)

ED029827

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

The Preparation Of Teachers For Junior Colleges

A Report on the Second Annual

MISSOURI VALLEY CONFERENCE
ON JUNIOR AND SENIOR
COLLEGE COOPERATION

May 5 and 6, 1967

SP002619

Central Missouri State College
Warrensburg, Missouri

— PROGRAM —

Friday, May 5, 1967

Registration—College Union . . Beginning 2:00 P.M.
Informal campus tours throughout the afternoon emphasizing facilities and programs related to preparation of junior college teachers.

Conference Dinner—Union Dining Room . . . 6:30 P.M.

Presiding — Dr. Warren C. Lovinger, President
Central Missouri State College

Invocation — Reverend Robert Barnett
First Methodist Church
Warrensburg, Missouri

Dinner — Buffet Style

Music—Modern Choir — Dr. Ralph E. Hart, Director
Woodwind Quintet — Mr. Russ Coleman, Director

Address — The Junior College Teacher, A New Breed?
Mr. Roger Garrison
Staff Associate for Faculty
American Association of Junior Colleges
Washington, D.C.

Hospitality Hour . . . . . Union Lounge

Saturday, May 6, 1967

General Session—Union Conference Room . . 8:30 A.M.

Presiding — Dr. Marion Schott
Dean of Teacher Education
Central Missouri State College

Address — "The Junior College of Tomorrow"
Dr. Elmer Clark
Dean, College of Education
Southern Illinois State University
Carbondale, Illinois

Coffee . . . . . 10:00 A.M.

Discussion Groups . . . . . 10:00 A.M.

Conference Luncheon—Union Dining Room . 12:00 Noon

Presiding — Dr. Roy McAuley
Chairman, Division of Language and Literature

Invocation — Reverend Richard E. Mehas
Reorganized Church of Jesus
Christ of Latter Day Saints
Warrensburg, Missouri

Music—Solo — Marcille Beach, soprano

Remarks—"The Conference As We See It"
Dean Clark and Mr. Garrison

Adjournment

Conference Chairman and Editor ..... Dr. Roy McAuley, Chairman
Division of Language and Literature
Central Missouri State College

FOREWORD

Currently the fastest growing segment of American higher education is the junior college. Recognizing that cooperation among all segments of higher education is essential to the educational climate and general welfare of our country, in 1966 Central Missouri State College instituted the Missouri Valley Conference on Junior and Senior College Cooperation.

This is the report of the second conference, held on the Central Missouri State College campus May 5 and 6, 1967. From seven states more than 150 junior college, college, and university teachers, administrators, and students gathered to discuss common problems and concerns with special emphasis on the preparation of the junior college teacher.

We think the addresses and the discussions were significant and are, therefore, pleased to share them with you.

Warren C. Lovinger, President
Central Missouri State College

The Junior College Teacher - A New Breed?

ROGER H. GARRISON
Staff Associate for Faculty
American Association of Junior Colleges

There is a question mark on the title of this talk because even those of us who have been immersed for years in the growth and problems of junior colleges are not quite sure that the junior college teacher is a new breed of instructor: he may, in fact, be a mutation. There is much talk about the junior college as a "unique" social institution, with "new" problems, and there is considerable truth in these assertions. However, the problems of junior colleges are not unique, in the sense that they are rare or singular or uncommon; but they certainly are **different,** both in kind and degree, from traditional four-year college or high school patterns, as these are familiar to us. The reality of these differences is, let me affirm strongly, worth identifying, both by junior colleges themselves—for themselves —and for higher education in general. For if the junior college is to establish its own identity as a developing force in higher education, it needs again and again to define and to explain its evolving nature and its special purposes. It is not enough for junior college spokesmen to state, as they do, that this is a "unique educational invention." The phrase sounds impressive; but it needs to be spelled out in substance.

What I will try to do in the next few minutes is to establish the matrix in which the particular problems and challenges of junior colleges exhibit themselves; and in doing this, perhaps the professional situation of the junior college teacher will be somewhat more clearly defined. And, surely, the context of teaching should suggest elements that must be included in the training and preparation of instructors for these colleges.

The Political-Educational Situation

Most junior college people exhibit a distinct ambivalence about their status in education. For example, it has literally been within the past decade that the public junior college has made the major shift from being Grades 13 and 14 of a public school district to a more independent situation, with local or regional automony in-over all govenrnance and financing. In many ways, psychologically as well as operationally, the junior college heritage has been elementary and secondary schools. But at the same time, the junior college aspires to be—drives urgently to be—a part of higher education.

"We should be neither," says Joseph P. Cosand, President of the St. Louis Junior College District. "We are unique, and provide an intermediate area with its own philosophy and objectives."

He rightly points out that the junior college teachers and administrators may well be slightly schizophrenic in this period of frantic growth and transition. "Our teachers want the salary schedule and security of secondary schools; yet they want the academic rank of the university. They want to teach, and not 'publish or perish,' but they want the teaching load of the university. They want NDEA funds for building purposes which really were for secondary schools—and so they ask the attorney generals to rule that they are secondary education; but at the same time, they want Higher Education Facilities Act money . . ."

Or, for example, the junior college teacher wants the sort of professional recognition accorded his four-year colleagues, both within his own institution and outside in the community. Yet he does not, apparently, accept unwritten sanctions that restrain his university colleagues from outright militancy; and he will unionize and strike, if necessary, to have his voice heard at policy-making levels.

The plain fact is that these apparently contraditory desires and positions are simply signs of evolving status—an evolution that is going to take some time and no little strain in the educational community.

Another significant difference from the four-year college teacher's usual situation is the junior college teacher's typically more direct relationship to the general public. In the comprehensive colleges, with a truly extraordinary spectrum of vocational, technical, and service-oriented programs, faculty work continually with advisory committees from the community, from industry and business. Specific local taxation supports "the junior college," making it a somewhat more focused object of attention than is now true of the total public school system. The college, more often than not (in the eyes of the community) is relatively new, it's "ours," and it serves not only the youth of the area, but increasing thousands of adults for whom it is a means of continuing education. Like the high school teacher, the junior college faculty member is, in fact, a public servant. After more than a hundred years of free public education, the public pretty well understands its lower schools. But it has yet to be educated (and to educate itself) more sophisticatedly about this "junior college" which insists that it is **not** a high school (though it offers many programs similar to those in comprehensive high schools), claims to be higher education (while teaching air frame mechanics,

printing, welding, and data processing), and is obviously wholly unlike what the general public has for years conceived higher education to be.

In brief, the junior college is far from having settled into a familiar pattern. Pressed increasingly by sheer numbers (a graph of student population growth looks like the swoop up to Everest's peak); multiplying special educational and training programs annually - even monthly; hard put already to staff the institutions with fully professional people in every area; it is small wonder that acceptable patterns of governance of these colleges have not yet emerged. A.A.U.P. guidelines are of small help, since for the most part these are based on traditional assumptions of college organization and management - yet these same guidelines are used, when opportune, by faculty to obtain leverage with administration. Regular high school patterns are, similarly, of little use, since their basic operational assumptions are apt to be authoritarian and prescriptive. Both junior college faculties and administrations are groping - sometimes with bruising clashes - for a distinctive pattern of governance, suitable to the new type of institution.

The Basic Problem - Aware Administrators

Among other problems - again, not "unique" to the junior college, but certainly more than urgent - is the shortage of adminstrators who not only know the score, but who also have some reasonably sophisticated grasp of the nature of the game they are in. This shortage, in large part, is a result of the comparative youth of most junior colleges. There simply has not been time for the needful cadre of maturely experienced persons to be developed and brought along from the ranks. This, too, will be remedied as junior colleges grow in experience toward more and more clear definition of themselves and their multiple missions. Training of leadership - at all levels - has high, possibly the highest, priority for the junior college as a whole, whether such training is through in-service experience (as seems most realistic) or by special graduate education.

The Faculty Situation

The faculty of a comprehensive junior college is, once more to cite "differences," a mix seeking to be an amalgam. Assemble instructors from a land grant college, a few from an Ivy League liberal arts institution, some from professional schools, skilled journeymen, technicians who are engineers-once-removed, green graduate students fresh from exposure to The Guild, retired military men seeking a seconded career, and high school teachers looking for some greener pasture in higher education, and you would have at least a raggedly accurate profile of such a faculty.

Bring, say, 450 of these diverse backgrounds and persons together to an urban junior college serving 14,000 students on three seperate campuses (and offering at least eighty different programs). Face them with a college that has grown 435% in the past four years, whose faculty "veterans" have been with the institution less than five years. Involve them in defining the mission(s) of the college - at best vaguely stated in the catalogue - knowing full well that these missions may be changing almost monthly. Have approximately 40% of this faculty teaching evening division mainly; and have 35% of the total faculty on part-time. Hire 65 new and replacement teachers each year - and find that you really need eighty when fall registration rolls around. Parcel the faculty into divisions, and divisions into departments, and departments into sub-departments; and, perforce, appoint division and department heads on faith of future responsible performance rather than on tested, long-term observation, since few of these teacher-administrators have been around for more than three or four years. Have four major buildings under construction, three in renovation, seven in the planning stage, and a fourth campus development being studied, having - of course - appointed faculty committees to study needs and make recommendations for the bricks-and-mortar translation of programs (some as yet non-existent) into usable space. Have two total faculty meetings a year, and accomplish this by the simple, arbitrary method of cancelling afternoon classes each time - otherwise, scheduled conflicts would make a meeting utterly impossible.

As a former university dean, now president of one of these exploding comprehensive colleges, remarked mildly, "I've got a different set of problems here."

Some Practical Realities

Another element of difference between teaching in the comprehensive junior college and in the traditional four-year institution is in the open pragmatism of its instructional aims. In its general liberal arts Associate degree programs, the junior college has two years to produce a transferrable student. General "culture" is all very well, and honored by constant assertion, but the blunt fact is in the question, "How many acceptable transfer students are we turning out?"

Similarly in the technical-vocational and other job-skill fields, the aim is frankly, usefully to produce employable graduates, whether from a full two-year sequence or from short-term certificate courses in a particular specialty. It is becoming increasingly evident (if industrial recruitment activity on junior college campuses is any measure) that the two-year college will more and more be the major source of technical and lower-level management manpower the country over.

The pragmatic emphasis naturally influences, and often even dictates, the nature of instruction. Teaching must be more immediate, more relevant to clearly-seen needs, more strictly sure that the student has "got it." Thus, the teacher becomes, not so much the traditional scholar, but rather the student-of-the-applicable, the needful, the useful. Indeed, a few of the very best junior colleges begin to approach the Whiteheadian dictum that "the school should turn out a pupil who knows something well and can do something well."

Faculty — A Different Direction of Growth

The "scholarship" of a junior college faculty member is, more likely than not, to be directed toward the enrichment of his teaching, rather than toward the discovery of new knowledge to add to the body of scholarship in a discipline. Indeed, the junior college instructor seeks a healthy symbiotic relationship to university researchers and scholars: he wants to learn how, with increasing skill, to use the fruits of the work of other men with sensitivity and perspective — and with a keen sense of the utility of knowledge. This is what his students need. This is what he aims to see that they get. His growth, therefore, is toward what could be called the scholarship of teaching — without in the least suggesting traditional school-of-education meanings for this phrase.

The Student-Centered Difference

Though I am not suggesting by comparison that four-year colleges are uninterested in their students as individuals (despite student jokes about IBM cards), the student-centered emphasis of the junior college is both a philosophy and a fact. Proportionately, two-year college faculty spend much more time and energy helping individual students than is typically true in universities, even in the lower divisions. Such work is apt to be, in the best sense, remedial, supportive, diagnostic, and is designed to get the student as rapidly as possible to an acceptable level of work. If the "difference" between philosophies can be oversimplified, it would be: in the four-year college, the student is brought to the discipline; in the two-year college, the discipline is brought to the student. This may smack suspiciously of spoon-feeding or mollycoddling (and sometimes it is), but the emphasis, I think, is just. The hope is, of course, in the junior college quite as much as in the senior institution, that the student will learn as soon as possible to cope independently with a discipline or a skill. A further difference — and it is not a small one — is that the junior college has only two years to try to accomplish this; the pressure of time is again a major factor affecting instruction.

Faculty Problems — Different in Degree

Junior college faculty problems differ in degree, if not in kind, from those of their four-year colleagues. Listed in rough order of priority, some of these problems are:

1. Lack of time, especially for study in one's own field.
2. Student loads (in many colleges teaching-hour loads of 16 to 20 hours and more are common).
3. Effective adaptation of instruction to extraordinarily heterogeneous groups of students. (Challenging superior students while simultaneously helping those who need remedial work.)
4. Understanding college policies in curriculum development, teaching responsibilities, relationships to guidance, and other areas.
5. Lack of clerical help (or lab assistance or instructional materials or a dozen other non-teaching supportive needs).
6. Evaluating (grading) student work in ways appropriate to (a) kinds of student ability, (b) nature of subject-mater, (c) college policies (if any).

Most of these problems are, of course, familiar to teachers, especially in secondary schools. But in the junior college, dealing as it does with freshman-sophomore age students; with mature adults from 25 to 75 (often mixed in the same classes); and insisting, as it does, on being "higher education," these problems take on added complexity: and answers to them are far from simple, either for the individual teacher or for his administrators.

Preparation of Junior College Teachers

Ordinarily, when we think of preparing college teachers, our minds lock into the traditional pattern of graduate work, with attendant degree attainments. Yet for the bulk of junior college teachers, this familiar route is either unnecessary, irrelevant, or both. Let me explain. In the comprehensive public junior colleges - and as these develop, they will instruct the largest percentage of students - nearly 70% of the instruction is in non-traditional areas: in vocational, pre-professional, technical, public service, and other immediately-job-related areas. Further, since about two-thirds of all junior college students do not continue their education, but move to employment, the traditional scholarship-oriented teaching, even of liberal arts and so-called "general education" subjects, is only partially appropriate to that proportionately small group which intends to transfer to four-year colleges and universities.

For example, most vocational instructors will have backgrounds of extensive work experience and on-the-job-training.

They will have little use for a "regular" academic post-baccalaureate M.A. or Ph.D. program. But what they will need are refresher and background courses germane to their specialties; and some real help, preferably not from formal courses in pedagogy, in **how to teach**. Their "preparation" for instruction, then, could well be in special summer institutes, special graduate seminars, or - as junior colleges are more recognizing - in thoroughly planned in-service experiences on their own campuses.

At the present time, the basic acceptable preparation in academic subjects for junior college teachers seems to be the Master,s degree - B.A. or B.S., plus 30 hours of credit, mainly in content.

But **desirable** preparation (i.e., most usful, or "best") as described - or inferred - by many faculty would have it in elements not now offered in M.A. programs. Adequately accomplished, these elements would require a post-baccalaureate period of study ranging from 16 months to two years.

(a) **Academic content.** A minimum of 10 courses (or equivalent) in subject discipline **at the graduate level.** (Undergraduate courses with "added work" for graduate students taking them were not thought to be satisfactory (main reason - the level of class discourse would not be sufficiently mature for advanced students). Of these ten courses, half should be, to the degree possible, **interdisciplinary** in content and in instruction. (Examples: biology-zoology-botany; sociology-psychology-anthropology; geography-geology-ecology.) Teachers felt that the interdisciplinary approach would (1) provide the necessary broader knowledge base for later teaching of general courses at the freshman-sophomore level; (2) diminish the research emphasis; (3) help the prospective teacher to have a more-than-usually flexible approach to materials and methods of instruction. Nothing in their recommendations suggested any watering-down of the quality of the graduate work; indeed, the emphsis was that the suggested approaches would be **more** rigorous in many ways than traditional graduate courses.

(b) **Supervised Teaching Experience.** At least one quarter, and preferably a full semester, of actual teaching responsibility in a cooperating junior college, with at least two preparations. This was not conceived of as "practice teaching" in its traditional sense. Rather, it was described as a **bona fide** internship, with supervision and counsel both from appropriate university faculty and veteran junior college faculty in the discipline. (Recommendations as to the timing of the intern experience varried, though the consensus was for second semester.) At the same time the graduate student was doing his intern teaching, he would also continue to take courses, though on a reduced load, in his field.

(c) **Professional Seminar.** Rather than separate course offerings in Educational Philosophy, Educational Psychology,

and Methods of Teaching (English, or whatever), teachers generlly recommended what could be considered a continuing professional seminar, involving all graduate students, from whatever discipline, who were undertaking this "enriched Master's degree" for prospective teachers. As a basic pattern, the Professional Seminar would meet for two hours every other week through the entire span of the graduate program. I would have its own syllabus of appropriate reading material, including recognized works on the history of education, the nature of the learning process, the psychology (and problems) of students, the nature of teaching, and the like. Ideally, the seminar would be led by carefully prepared teams of graduate professors and veteran junior college instructors, or Master Teachers.

(d) **Degree recognition.** Most teachers making these recommendations felt strongly that no "new" degree was needed for such a program. Rather, they asserted that it would "make the M.A. respectable again." They suggested that, in addition to the awarding of the M.A. itself, certificates of Internship Experience and Completion of Professional Seminar could be added to the candidate's dossier.

Such a program as outlined has a number of distinct advantages to recommend it.

(1) It is open-ended. A successful completion of this program would not hinder an interested student from going right on for a Ph.D. if he wished, since his 30 hours of course work would more than likely be acceptable to most graduate departments.

(2) It would conceivably be completed in a summer-academic year-summer pattern, thus reducing a student's financial commitments.

(3) It would, in most areas, make him a desirable candidate for a junior college faculty.

In summary, I have tried to sketch briefly a few of the more singificant problems - "different," if not unique - of the junior college by describing a little of the context in which they occur. The comprehensive two-year public college is, indeed, an institution whose time has come. It is a response to a country's aspiration that its citizens shall have open-ended educational opportunity. It is a functional answer to the spreading needs of a technical-industrial society now full-tide in a cybernetic revolution. Like most of our social institutions, it will be called upon for ever more and more services, while at the same time - mainly because of lack of full understanding of the public - it will be endemically under-financed, understaffed, and over-populated. That the junior college will solve its problems as timegoes on, most of us hope and believe. How the problems will be solved - and when, if soon enough - and if at the high professional level we hope for - are matters that keep those of us in junior colleges restless at night and plague us, on occasion, with bad dreams.

The Junior College of Tomorrow

ELMER J. CLARK
Dean, College of Education
Southern Illinois University

In order to clarify our role in helping to improve the junior college it is in order that we agree upon some of the goals toward which this institution should work. For the purpose of discussion let us consider the following as desirable characteristics of the junior college of tomorrow.

1. It should have strong public and private support.
2. It should embrace a comprehensive, democratic philosophy.
3. It should be administered efficiently and effectively.
4. It should coordinate its activities with other educational and vocational agencies.
5. It should have an effective faculty which is especially prepared for and dedicated to junior college instruction.
6. It should maintain rigorous but appropriate academic standards.
7. It should concentrate its activity upon the education and guidance of its student body.
8. It should recognize its role as an influential institution of the community.

Institutional Support

Historically the junior college has been hampered by a lack of public and private support. In many cases it has been added on to the senior high school or has been an outgrowth of a four year college or university. The development of separate junior colleges, with clearly identified means of support, is a relatively recent and most desirable development.

An almost universal falacy concerning the junior college is that it costs less to educate students in a junior college than it does in a four-year institution. Leland Medsker, in his book **The Junior College: Progress and Prospect** presented data to indicate that when only **teaching** salaries were considered, omitting money for faculty research and other related expenses, the cost per student credit hour in certain junior colleges was as high or higher than at the junior division of larger institutions. Whether or not Medsker's conclusions are correct, it is obvious that a sound program of junior college instruction will cost substantially more than we have been willing to pay in the past. A sharp increase in per pupil expenditure at this level is clearly necessary if we are to develop first-rate institutions.

It is promising indeed to note the movement in many states toward a master plan for higher education, with junior colleges being given apropriate recognition. Gerald W. Smith, Executive Director of the Illinois Junior College Board, has written an article entitled, "An Action Report on Illinois Junior Colleges," which summarizes such master plan activity in Illinois. Speaking of the Public Junior College Act, Smith stated:

> Some of the distinctive features of the act are: (a) identification of junior-college education as a part of the state system of higher education, (b) open admissions, (c) universal local financial support, (d) relatively high level of state support for operation and construction, and (e) comprehensive programs.
>
> Junior-college education has been made a part of the state structure for organization and management of higher education. The act broadens the responsibilities of the State Board of Higher Education to include the junior colleges. The Illinois Junior College Board was established as a supervising, coordinating, service agency for all of the junior-college districts. Independent local junior-college boards are created to govern each junior-college district and are given powers and duties similar to those of the governing boards of the senior public colleges and universities.
>
> An open-door admissions policy is a requirement of the Public Junior College Act. Colleges are expected to provide programs designed to meet a wide range of interests, aptitudes, and abilities. The act says: "The Class I junior-college districts shall admit all students qualified to complete any one of their programs including general education, transfer, occupational, technical, and terminal, as long as space for effective instruction is available. After entry, the college shall counsel and distribute the students among its programs according to their interests and abilities. Students allowed entry in college transfer programs must have ability and competence similar to that possesed by students admitted to state universities for similar programs. Entry-level competence to such college transfer programs may be achieved through successful completion of other preparatory courses offered by the college. If space is not available for those best qualified, using rank in class and ability and all students applying, the Class I junior college will accept achievement tests as guides, and shall give preference to students residing in the district."
>
> Colleges are encouraged to provide basic courses in preparation for more advanced work for those students whose prior work has been inadequate.
>
> Several aspect of junior-college financing are worth noting: In general, the act provides that a college may

receive income from local taxes, state revenue, federal funds, and student tuition. [1]

It should not be inferred that Illinois has suddenly solved its junior college problems through this legislation. It has taken substantial steps, however, toward the provision of sound support for this institution. Similar activity in other states is also most encouraging. Certainly, public and private support must be increased substantially if the junior college is to play its proper role in tomorrow's educational scene.

Philosophic Considerations

Typically a particular junior college has stressed either transfer or terminal education. To endorse the philosophy that a single institution should emphasize both functions has been a slow development. However, Dorothy M. Knoell and Leland L. Medsker detected such a trend when reporting recently in their book, **From Junior to Senior College: A National Study of the Transfer Student,** which is a report based on a project sponsored by the Joint Committee on Junior and Senior Colleges. Their recommendation concerning the function of the junior college was:

> It might be preferable to cease referring to programs as "terminal" and "transfer" and, instead, to recognize the student's right to be either terminal or transfer in either type of program, depending upon his achievement, abilities, and changing interests. As the four-year colleges become more selective at the freshman level, there will be increasing pressures to become selective in admitting students into junior college transfer programs. Consideration should be given to the question of whether the transfer "umbrella" for all nonvocational students is really appropriate. [2]

It should not be inferred that the only philosophic question to be solved by junior college people involves the comprehensiveness of the program. Additional discussion groups might consider: (1) Appropriate objectives for the junior college, (2) The role of the junior college in promoting democratic ideals, and (3) The common elements of terminal and transfer programs.

Administrative Procedures

Just as in all of higher education, administrative procedures have been developed for the junior college without a concerted effort to achieve efficiency and a democratic motif. Bcause this institution has more often been attached to a higher or lower school than to be independent, a tendency toward divisiveness has developed.

In order to improve the quality of junior college administrators it is recommended that a special graduate curriculum leading to a specialist's degree or doctorate be developed. It should be assumed that only persons with unusual aptitude and interest be selected. The program of preparation should include some depth in a teaching area; breadth in such fields as anthropology, sociology, and psychology; specialized preparation in junior college administration; and an administrative internship in a junior college especially noted for being innovative and comprehensive.

It is especially important that the prospective administrator have professional experience. Too often we look upon such experience as superflous. Harold Benjamin, writing in **Democracy in the Administration of Higher Education,** identified such a viewpoint by saying:

> This is one of the most dangerous weaknesses in American higher education today. It causes some universities to descend to the level of believing that a trained administrator, a man who has run banks, oil companies, armies, or political parties is a wonderful "find" for a university presidency. Far from being disturbed by the new "scholar's" lack of the most elementary preparation for academic leadership, even certain faculty members appear to think that they are lucky to have someone uncontaminated by educational experience; they appear to rate their own academic preparation so low as to think that possession of the training and degrees of a university teacher tends to disqualify a man for high administrative position in the university. Perhaps this is because university teachers are increasingly kept from "meddling" in administrative matters. They are therefore supposed to be innocent of the guile and commonsense developed so superbly in county, state, and national politics, in the slick maneuverings of the market place, or in the weighty process of approving the decisions of a glittering military staff.
>
> One feature of this deterioration of professional pride and competence in the central work of the university is found in the current disdain for teaching, a disdain expressed in actions rather than works. There is no dean of any school or college in any American university who cannot teach at least one course or seminar, if he is competent to hold a deanship, and who would not benefit as an administrator from such teaching, yet in the smallest institutions many "masters" hasten to discard all teaching tasks as soon as magic mantles of administrative authority settle upon their shoulders. Even department chairmen sometimes appear to measure their administrative worth by the fewness or brevity of their actual contacts with students, while

the president who goes into a classroom under any circumstances, even as the most casual lecturer and even when his institution is not as big as a moderate sized high school, is so rare as to be practically nonexistent. The president of a small college usually feels that he is so tied up with grave administrative responsibilities that he can talk only with deans and directors. When he lectures it must be in the big auditorium on the broadest possible subjects—what to do about communism, how to avoid atomic warfare, or some other large topic—for which task he has been prepared by being an administrator.[3]

One of the basic administrative problems faced by administrators of junior colleges, especially the newer colleges, is accreditation. There is no single route which will insure accreditation. It is encouraging to note, however, that regional accrediting bodies such as the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools are supplying special consultants to work with emerging institutions. This agency asks seven very important questions about any college or university.

1. What is the educational task of the institution?
2. Are the necessary resources available for carrying out the task of the institution?
3. Is the institution well-organized for carrying out its educational task?
4. Are the programs of instruction adequate in kind and quality to serve the purposes of the institution?
5. Are the institution's policies and practices such as to foster high faculty morale?
6. Is student life on campus relevant to the institution's educational task?
7. Is student achievement consistent with the purposes of the institution?[4]

A detailed examination of each junior college in terms of these basic questions would be most profitable, whether the school is well-established, emerging, or in the early planning stages. Such an examination could result in suggestions as to how the college might be improved.

Coordination with Other Agencies

A basic problem for all junior colleges is to articulate its work with the high schools, colleges, and other agencies. Let us consider here only the relationship between junior and senior colleges, since that is the basic theme of the meeting.

A most helpful booklet, entitled **Guidelines for Improving Articulation between Junior and Senior Colleges** has been

produced by the Joint Committee on Junior and Senior Colleges, an agency of three organizations: The Association of American Colleges, The American Association of Junior Colleges, and The American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers. Matters of admissions, evaluation of transfer courses, curriculum planning, advising, counseling, and other student personnel services, and articulation programs are given consideration in this publication.

The Joint Committee presented a challenge to all persons interested in closer relationships between junior and senior colleges when it stated:

> The public institutions of higher education in each state have a recognized obligation to work together to reach agreement concerning guidelines and to live up to them once adopted. Independent institutions also have an important contribution to make in adopting guidelines for transfer. The inability of the independent institutions to subscribe to particular guidelines statements should not be grounds for omitting them from areas of agreement which are important to the public segment of higher education in the various states.
>
> If the guidelines are to be effective, an attitude of mutual respect and cooperation is very urgently needed. Articulation, representing the needs and interests of the individual student and his professors, and cooordination, representing the interests of society and the state, should be carried on in an atmosphere of interdependence among institutions having common concerns in higher education. This interdependence will grow stronger as the proportion of students who take their lower division work in two-year colleges increases. Greater public recogntion of the role of the junior college in higher education should come with this change. However, certain outside pressures for compulsory coordination may also arise unless voluntary agreements are reached and translated into appropriate action.
>
> The **Guidelines** provide no easy solutions for transfer problems, but hopefully they will stimulate planning within the various states which will lead to the establishment or improvement of permanent articulation procedures for resolving problems of transfer. [5]

Faculty Effectiveness

Dr. Lyman Glenny, Executive Director of the Illinois Board of Higher Education last year appointed a special Committee on Junior College Personnel. Dr. Eric Johnson of Illinois State University was named chairman and representatives were named from each of the other state universities. Your speaker

was selected as the delegate from Southern Illinois University. The Committee has considered in depth the problems involved in providing administrators, counselors, teachers, and other personnel for the rapidly growing system of junior colleges in Illinois. While a final report has not yet been published, it seems certain that some of the conclusions of this group will be:

1. There is an established need for teaching personnel in the junior colleges of Illinois.
2. There is also an established need for administrative and guidance personnel in these colleges.
3. Special graduate programs should be established to prepare teachers for the junior colleges. Some basic principles to be followed in establishing curricula for these persons are:

   A. Provision should be made for the candidate to obtain a graduate major in the subject area or areas in which he is preparing to teach.

   B. The student should have specialization within a particular discipline but also should have enough breadth that he will be capable of teaching survey courses of an interdisciplinary nature.

   C. Provision should be made for a minor in professional courses. This should include: (1) a survey course about junior colleges and junior college teaching; (2) a course in educational psychology with stress upon measurement, learning theories, and application of psychological principles to junior college teaching; and (3) a supervised internship at the junior college level.

   D. The minimum preparation for a beginning teacher at the junior college level should be the master's degree. However, it is highly recommended that a sixth year program, leading to an Educational Specialist's degree, be established for those persons desiring to remain in junior college teaching.

   E. A special doctoral program, stressing teaching instead of research, should be provided for prospective junior college teachers. While the degree probably would be classified as one in "Education" it should have a strong emphasis on subject area competence.

   F. Persons interested in teaching the technical and vocational subjects should be required to have trade or industrial experience in their areas of interest.

4. Special graduate programs should be established for persons interested in administrative or guidance assignments in junior colleges. Some basic principles in establishing curricula for these persons are:
   A. The candidate should qualify as a junior college teacher, with a minimum of a master's degree as suggested above.
   B. Programs leading to the Educational Specialist's and Doctor of Education degrees should be established for such areas as junior college administrator, junior college business management, and junior college student personnel work.
   C. Internships at the junior college level should be required as part of the preparation of administrative and guidance personnel.
5. Special efforts must be made to recruit candidates for junior college positions and the provision made for these persons to obtain special graduate fellowships in order that they might pursue the graduate programs mentioned above.

Another most promising development in Illinois is the Ford Occupational Instructor Project, which is being sponsored through a $200,000 four-year grant of the Ford Foundation. This program is being carried out by the Junior College District of St. Louis and St. Louis County and Southern Illinois University. Dr. Kenneth A. Brunner, Chairman of the Department of Higher Education at Southern Illinois University, is serving as interim director of the project.

Three master's degree curricula have been established for this project: (1) a one-year program for teachers of academic courses for occupational students, such as communications, social science, and technical mathematics; (2) a one-year program for teachers of occupational courses, such as data processing, secretarial science, civil technology, dental hygiene, and library assisting; and (3) a three-year program for graduates of two-year, post-high school occupational programs with associate degrees or similar awards.

Persons working on the one-year programs who are on a full time basis will spend two or three quarters at the university and a semester in an internship at the junior college district. Those who have an assistantship will increase their time at the university to four or five quarters. Students enrolled in the three-year programs will spend eight to nine hours at the university and one semester at the junior college district.

Course work for the master's degree will include: (1) 29-30 quarter hours in the major field; (2) 12 quarter hours for the internship, including a course entitled Internship in Higher

Education; (3) a four quarter hour course entitled The Community Junior Colelge; and (4) a three quarter hour course entitled Principles and Philosophy of Industrial, Vocational, and Technical Education. Stipends will be paid during the internship period at one-half the rate paid for full-time faculty members with comparable qualifications.

The present plan is to schedule a minimum of ten to fifteen students for the internship experience in the fall of 1967 and not over twenty-five to thirty students each succeeding semester through the spring of 1970. It is hoped that about one hundred persons will be graduated from this program during the four-year period, 1967-1970.

Further details concerning the Ford Project may be obtained by writing to Dr. Brunner.

Academic Standards

The junior colleges of tomorrow will need to give even greater attention to the matter of academic standards than we have done in the past. They are faced with rising standards on the part of four-year colleges at the same time that the group to be served by the junior college is expanding.

It is hoped that faculties will establish uniform academic standards, whether the student is enrolled in terminal or transfer courses. A basic role of the faculty is to screen out persons who will not be successful in either venture. However, effective teaching may save many marginal students. With greatly increased numbers this will represent a great challenge to junior college administrators and faculty members in the years to come.

Education and Guidance of Students

This presentation has emphasized the importance of improving the instruction in junior colleges. Another vital consideration is to provide effective counseling for junior college students. In the Knoell and Medsker survey mentioned earlier, the following implications for guidance were cited:

> Improvements in counseling will come about only as a result of related actions on several fronts. First, college administrators and board members need to be convinced of the contribution which counseling could make to the total educational experience of the students, given adequate financial support and appropriately trained staff. Unless budget- and policy-makers recognize the need for increased suport for counseling, the other changes will be relatively ineffective. The second strong need is for the upgrading of both pre-service and in-service training programs for counselors, particularly for the junior colleges. The goals and objectives of junior college counseling need to be defined more clearly as one basis for developing more appropriate

counselor training programs. The needs of the transfer students for counseling services should be examined in the light of the new information from this study. The implication is **not** that counseling now being done is poor, but that there is not enough of it and that too few students are now benefitting from present counseling services. [6]

Role of Junior College in the Community

That the junior college is an important agency of the community has been established for many years. However, too little consideration has been given to the potentiality of using the community as a laboratory for junior college instruction. A recent report by Richard C. Richardson, Jr. and Paul A. Elsner told of a special program by the Forest Park Community College (St. Louis) in which students work with disadvantaged youngsters. [7] Another project described by Ralph M. Besse brought Negros from the ghetto areas of a city into a special junior college program. [8] Many such examples of community action projects may be cited, yet we know that the potential is far from being reached.

Junior colleges, whether in an urban or rural setting, are surrounded by opportunities for sociological and psychological community studies. If we ignore these potential laboratories, we shall deny the best possible place in which to learn, and at the same time we shall be failing to meet the needs of our communities.

Conclusions

There is no panacea to solve all of the problems of today's junior colleges. However, if we are to improve this institution tomorrow, there are many important problems to be solved.

Perhaps our most important single goal should be to strive for excellence in the junior colleges of tomorrow. Francis Keppel spoke of this goal four years ago, and his thoughts seem just as appropriate today. He commented that:

> It was Thornton Wilder who said, "every good and excellent thing . . . stands moment by moment on the razor-edge of danger and must be fought for."
>
> Quality in the educational enterprise is a "good and excellent thing," and the standards must be continuously reviewed and "fought for."
>
> With high quality education and broad educational opportunities, we can sharpen the intellectual capacities and curiosities of the rising generation, create the new tools that the civilization requires, and produce new leaders equipped to add to the ever-accumulating store of knowledge. We can also help our young people to make better

use of knowledge as a tool to advance social and cultural life and the welfare of the world community.

> The junior colleges of our nation have a position of growing importance in our educational enterprise. For them, as for all educational institutions, standards of excellence must be such that the student learns and the way he learns it can meet every test of tomorrow's world. And we cannot wait until tomorrow to educate for tomorrow's need. 9

All of us in the Missouri Valley are deeply concerned about our junior colleges. If we are to build for excellence tomorrow, we must devote all of our time and effort toward solving the problems we face today. The products of tomorrow's colleges will give evidence as to our success.

FOOTNOTES

1. Gerald W. Smith, "An Action Report on Illinois Junior Colleges," *Illinois Education Association Discussion Topic,* February, 1967, p. 18.
2. Dorothy M. Knoell and Leland Medsker, *From Junior to Senior Colleges A National Study of the Transfer Student.* (Washington, 1965), p. 89.
3. Harold Benjamin, ed., *Democracy in the Administration of Higher Education,* (New York, 1960), pp. 12-13.
4. North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, *Guide for the Evaluation of Institutions of Higher Learning,* (Chicago, 1966).
5. Joint Committee on Junior and Senior Colleges, *Guidelines for Improving Articulation Between Junior and Senior Colleges,* (Washinton, 1966), pp. 5-6.
6. Dorothy M. Knoell, op. cit., p. 97.
7. State of Illinois Board of Education, *A Master Plan for Higher Education in Illinois,* (Springfield, 1964).
8. State of Illinois Board of Education, *A Master Plan-Phase II for Higher Education in Illinois,* (Springfield, 1966).
9. Francis Keppel, "Standards of Excellence," *Junior College Journal,* September, 1963, pp. 8-11.

DISCUSSION RESUME

Teacher Training

The junior college instructor is unique in the teaching profession. He requires knowledge and ability different from that of the high school teacher, and because of the broadness of the instructional demands upon him it is not desirable that he specialize to the degree generally expected of the college and university professor. There is even a question whether or not academic degrees for certain vocational, technical and trades instructors are possible, practical, or desirable. For many of these people real experience in the areas to be taught is the essntial thing.

In academic fields a broad master's degree is desirable, with additional training leading to a sixth year degree of some nature. The traditional doctorate with emphasis upon research is, in most instances, not the best training.

Of considerable value are short courses, seminars, and brief institutes (even as short as one week). These should stress the history and philosophy of the junior college, the nature of teaching, characteristics of students, group dynamics and general orientation to junior college procedures. For those with no previous teaching experience, such items as the use of teaching equipment, concepts of student evaluation, and some of the general mechanical aspects of teaching should be considered.

State colleges and universities must share in the preparation of junior college teachers; however, there are problems. Universities still tend to stress research rather than teaching. State colleges often lack the facilities for providing supervisors and meaningful student teaching experience. Many university professors appear to misunderstand or disdain the junior college, and thus direct their students away from it. Nevertheless, the need remains for state colleges and universities to develop imaginative programs for the preparation of junior college teachers within those areas of their competencies.

A teaching internship would be significant in this training. There are serious questions, however, relative to whether or not junior colleges could and/or would cooperate, and if prospective teachers would be willing to delay their degrees and full earning capacities while interning.

Recruiting and Teacher Availability

There does exist a shortage of qualified junior college teachers. While this is partially attributed to the scarcity of teachers at all levels, there are some additional problems facing the junior colleges. In many trade/vocational/technical fields, college, university and teacher placement agencies prove almost fruitless. In these instances advertising in newspapers and trade journals, and personal recruitment have proved effective.

Others may be recruited from holders of baccalaureate degrees who are willing to obtain the training essential for junior college teaching. High school instructors wishing to enter the field of higher education and preparing themselves to do so, and college and university teachers more interested in teaching than research and publishing, might also serve as a sources of supply. Vigorous grant, scholarship, fellowship and assistantship programs are needed to encourage prospects.

Once teachers are recruited there must be efforts to retain them. Business, industry, colleges and universities are all presently what might appear to be greener pastures to the junior college teacher. The higher pay, more realistic work and student loads, and the availability of qualified assistants prove most attractive.

There is a problem of status. Right now, in many instances junior college teachers are neither fish nor fowl. The various branches of higher education should embrace these people and urge them into their respective professional organizations. Colleges and universities must offer those who desire to be teachers understanding, meaningful training, and continuing interest and cooperation. When these things become the rule, the status of junior college teachers will improve.

Junior College Administrators

What is the source of junior college administrators? Should they be secondary administrators because of their experience in community concern and function, or should they come from colleges and universities because of their understanding of higher education? Perhaps they should come from neither of these areas, but should be developed within and by the junior colleges themselves.

Since experience is worth more than just reading a book or taking a course, an internship might prove of value. In some manner the junior college administrator must learn institutional finance, personnel psychology and management, constituent dynamics, and how to communicate both orally and in writing.

The Admission of Students

Admissions policies create discussion at any meeting of those interested in junior colleges. Because many private junior colleges are oriented toward transfer programs only, it is understandable that their admissions be on about the same bases as four-year colleges. However, because two-thirds of public junior college enrollees do not continue toward the baccalaureate, as indicated by Roger Garrison, these institutions should admit on much different considerations. Public junior colleges are not abbreviated liberal arts colleges. They must possess a knowledge of the many different kinds of students they can and should serve, and develop admissions procedures accordingly. Thus, they are called upon to be both vocational and transfer

oriented. Not only will they serve as the terminal formal training for the majority of the students, but they will also serve as partners of the colleges and universities in four-year baccalaureate programs.

Even with its dual role the first two years, regardless of transfer or vocational direction, should on individual evaluation be considered acceptable for transfer, with no loss of credit, to baccalaureate institutions. Few senior colleges require underclassmen to finally and irrevocably commit themselves to particular degrees or vocations. Then why place this demand upon students, who because of fate or choice, find themselves in junior colleges? Is it conceivable that in our technical age a vocational student receives as good a foundation for continuing education as does the liberal arts or general education student?

Because of transfer difficulties, occasional student, parent and alumni pressures, and unique ambitions some junior colleges desire to become baccalaureate schools. In a few instances this might be the right direction and possibly solve some individual problems. However, in most cases actual service to the community and all its educational needs might be hindered. A real solution is in the understanding and acceptance of the junior college functions, and the sincere cooperation of all institutions of higher learning in the effort to provide meaningful post-secondary, adult, and service education for every person in every community.

CHAIRMEN OF DISCUSSION GROUPS

Mr. Ray Walsh, Dean
Jefferson County Junior College
Hillsboro, Missouri

Dr. Francis English, Dean
College of Arts and Sciences
University of Missouri
Columbia, Missouri

Mr. Fred E. Davis, Director
Public Junior Colleges
State Department of Education
Jefferson City, Missouri

Dr. Harold Condit, Dean
Graceland College
Lamoni, Iowa

Dr. A. H. Proctor
Executive Vice President
Kansas State College
Pittsburg, Kansas

RECORDERS OF DISCUSSION GROUPS

All of Central Missouri State College

Berniece Craig
Department of English

Dr. Agnes Horton
Department of History

Dr. John Horine
Department of Industrial Arts
and Technology

Dr. Perry Mock
Department of Business
Administration

Dr. Harold Sampson
Department of Speech